

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bing Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Holley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bing Elementary School

6409 36TH AVE S, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To empower students to take ownership of their academic achievement and practice positive character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bing Elementary envisions every child will attain unlimited educational possibilities while being a responsible productive and caring citizen.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cook, Kimberly	Principal	Leads the schools vision. Serves as the instructional leader, HR and facilities manager. Responsible for all aspects of running the school.
Valenti, Wayne	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal with all administrative responsibilities. Serves as the instructional leader of the school.
Hollingshed, Shemia	School Counselor	Coordinates and implements the school counseling program
Clarke, Maria	ELL Compliance Specialist	Maintains and monitors the implementation of the ESOL Program. Provides PD for school personnel. Responsible for complying with FTE rules and guidelines from the FDOE and USDOE.
Concepcion, Danielle	Other	Provides services that enhance home, school, and community partnerships. Actively addresses barriers that interfere with student performance and achievement by bringing people together while creating an environment that is conducive to effective problem solving and learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/2/2021, Cheryl Holley

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

411

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	63	57	90	58	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	24	27	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	37	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	30	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	61	76	67	65	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	18	26	25	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	61	76	67	65	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	18	26	25	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	52%	57%	36%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%	43%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	54%	63%	43%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	57%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	46%	51%	38%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	50%	53%	30%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	51%	3%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

IReady for grades 1-5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	22	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	22	39
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	40
	English Language Learners	26	25	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	15	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	85	13	39
	Students With Disabilities	40	40	40
	English Language Learners	18	25	50

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	34	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	35	50
	Students With Disabilities	20	30	30
	English Language Learners	0	11	19
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	27	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	25	45
	Students With Disabilities	20	30	30
	English Language Learners	4	15	32

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	31	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	32	49
	Students With Disabilities	29	33	33
	English Language Learners	16	23	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	16	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	15	36
	Students With Disabilities	14	17	29
	English Language Learners	4	16	35

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	15	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	14	29
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	33
	English Language Learners	11	10	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	18	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	14	43
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	44
	English Language Learners	5	20	30

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	22	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	19	30
	Students With Disabilities	36	37	46
	English Language Learners	5	5	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	20	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	20	35
	Students With Disabilities	20	39	44
	English Language Learners	0	10	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	41		20	29		7				
ELL	30	63		39	56		22				
BLK	12	13		14	27		8				
HSP	40	65		42	50		34				
MUL	36			29							
WHT	30	69		50	62		15				
FRL	31	50	47	35	41	24	22				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	20	19	48	67	46					
ELL	41	47	50	69	87	72	42				
BLK	28	37	50	47	70	46	27				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	48	54	55	74	85	83	57				
WHT	51	52		71	78		75				
FRL	43	50	50	66	82	74	52				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	48	47	20	30		17				
ELL	32	46	61	35	44	47	21				
BLK	22	33	42	33	43	36	21				
HSP	38	48	62	42	49	45	30				
WHT	49	40		58	58						
FRL	35	43	53	41	48	38	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	15
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There was a dramatic decrease in scores in all subject areas and subgroups. ELA Proficiency saw a 12% drop, Math proficiency saw a 31% drop, Science proficiency saw a 27% drop. ELA BQ gains saw a 6% drop. There was a 39% drop in Math gains and a 51% drop in Math BQ gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Learning Gains and BQ Learning Gains, SWD Proficiency and Learning Gains.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There were many students who were eLearning and an experienced Math Coach left the school, All students are back on campus for on campus learning this year so that should contribute to an increase in student achievement. We are looking to hire an experienced Math Coach and the district is providing Math support for our school from our assigned District Resource Teacher. She will be providing PD sessions, as well as working with the teachers to assist them in planning rigorous, standards aligned lessons.

Our ESE Resource Teachers are working with the ESE students and providing acceleration to their learning. The ESE Resource teachers are planning with the classroom teachers to ensure the students are receiving grade level instruction in addition to the acceleration to their learning.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Learning Gains-1% improvement from previous year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Two experienced Reading Coaches worked with teachers on planning and provided them with PD opportunities.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Weekly planning sessions so that lessons are rigorous, aligned to the standards, and provide opportunities to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

-Student Engagement Strategies

-Purposeful Planning

-Additional PD sessions will be provided based on individual teacher and staff needs based on student data and as classroom observations are done.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

- Classroom Walkthroughs with High Quality Feedback
- In Depth Data Dives

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A critical need was found in ELA from our FSA data which showed that only 33% of our students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading and only 44% of our bottom quartile students made learning gains in reading.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of students will show one year’s worth of targeted growth in Reading based on the iReady end of year diagnostic.

Monitoring: Mid Year and End of Year iReady Diagnostic data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional Coaching: effect size – 0.88;
 Planning with standards aligned instruction: effect size 0.75;
 Coaching toward Differentiation: effect size 1.29 and Scaffolding: effect size 0.42.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. This will in turn improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration, the Leadership Team, and the district assigned Reading DRT will analyze student data/ develop a scope/sequence aligned to the data while coaching ELA Teachers and providing professional development opportunities to improve their instruction. Teacher teams will have grade level common planning time and monitor student data. Administration and district assigned DRT's will lead coaching cycles for teachers, create a scope and sequence based on data and provide learning of the new BEST standards in ELA. In addition, once each quarter data/planning days will be provided for reading teachers in grades K-5. Substitutes will be needed to provide this intensive professional development and planning. Planning/ data sessions will be monitored by administration. ELA walkthroughs will be conducted by administration and the Reading DRT.

Person Responsible Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A critical need was found for Math from the 2021 FSA data, which showed that only 37% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient in math. This is a drop of 31% from 2019. Only 42% of our 3-5 teachers made gains in Math (39% drop from 2019) and only 22% of our bottom quartile made learning gains (51% drop from 2019),

Measurable Outcome: 50% of our students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the FSA. 60% of students will show learning gains on the FSA.

Monitoring: Weekly mathematics assessments
Monthly mathematics assessments
iReady Diagnostic assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional Coaching: effect size – 0.88;
Planning with standards aligned instruction: effect size 0.75;
Coaching toward Differentiation: effect size 1.29 and Scaffolding: effect size 0.42.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional Coaching as High Quality Professional Development by Laura M. Desimone and Katie Pak

Learning Communities: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration, the Leadership Team and the district assigned Math DRT will:

Analyze student data and develop a scope and sequence that is aligned to the data, facilitate grade level planning, lead coaching cycles, progress monitor student data and provide coaching.

Utilize K-5 Mathematics in Practice teacher guides weekly grade level planning sessions and embedded in intervention groups in grades K-5

Once each quarter teachers will be provided data/planning days for Math in grades K-5. Substitutes will be needed to provide this intensive professional development and planning.

Planning sessions and data sessions will be monitored by administration.

Math walkthroughs will be conducted by administration/math district resource teacher for calibration and alignment to goals developed in planning.

Person Responsible Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A critical need was found in our ESSA subgroup-Students with Disabilities because it had a Federal Index of 26% and our FSA data showed that only 10% of our SWD students in grades 3-5 are proficient in reading, only 38% of our SWD students made learning gains in reading, and only 33% of our bottom quartile Students with Disabilities made learning gains in reading. In math, only 14% of our Students with Disabilities were proficient, only 25% of our Students with Disabilities made learning gains, and only 11% of our bottom quartile Students with Disabilities made learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: 50% of our Students with Disabilities in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on the FSA in Reading and Math and 75% of our Students with Disabilities will make learning gains on the FSA in Reading and Math.

Reading
Mid Year and End of Year iReady Diagnostic data
Reading PMA's and Mid Year Assessments

Monitoring: Math
Weekly mathematics assessments
Math Monthlies
Mid Year and End of Year iReady Diagnostic assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Planning with standards aligned instruction: effect size 0.75;
Comprehensive interventions for students who are learning disabled: effect size 0.77
Learning acceleration: effect size 0.68
Coaching toward differentiation: effect size 1.29 and Scaffolding: effect size 0.42.
Small group learning: effect size 0.49

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities: Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment.

Utilizing instructional coaching and planning will help teachers provide rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards. This will in turn improve student achievement.

Differentiated Small Group Instruction in the areas of Reading and Math will help accelerate student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration, the Leadership Team, and the ESE Resource Teachers will analyze student data to develop a scope/sequence aligned to the data and the goals on each student's Individualized Education Plan. This information will be shared with the classroom teachers during Professional Learning Communities (PLC's). Teacher teams will have grade level common planning time with the ESE Resource Teachers to plan lessons that best meet the needs of the Students with Disabilities and are standards aligned and monitor student data. The ESE Resource Teachers will coteach with the classroom teachers in order to provide their students with grade level instruction (based on IEP goals). In addition, the students will be provided differentiated small group instruction through the Extended Learning Plan.

Person Responsible Kimberly Cook (kimberly.cook@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Bing ranked higher than the statewide average in behavior incidents. We have an incident rate of 2.5 per 100 students, which is higher than the states rate of 1.0 per 100 students. We implement PBIS at the school and have provided teachers with PD in this area. The counselor is providing students with strategies to improve their behavior. We are providing incentives for students whose behavior improves.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)
Leader in Me

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration - modeling and facilitating
PBIS Team - developing plans, monitoring progress, providing incentives and next steps
Lighthouse Team (Leader in Me) - Overseeing PBIS team, providing support if needed